



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
09/096,999	06/13/98	KARPEN	D 950901

ALFRED M WALKER  
PATENT ATTORNEY  
225 OLD COUNTRY ROAD  
MELVILLE NY 11747-2712

MM12/0706

EXAMINER

VU, D

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2821	2

DATE MAILED: 07/06/99

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

# Office Action Summary

Application No.  
**09/096,999**

Applicant(s)  
**Karpen**

Examiner  
**David Vu**

Group Art Unit  
**2821**



- ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_.
- ☐ This action is **FINAL**.
- ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, **prosecution as to the merits is closed** in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 3 month(s), or thirty days, whichever is longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a).

## Disposition of Claims

- ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the application.
- Of the above, claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are rejected.
- ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- ☐ Claims \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- ☒ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.
- ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to by the Examiner.
- ☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.
- ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).
- ☐ All ☐ Some\* ☐ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been
- ☐ received.
- ☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) \_\_\_\_\_.
- ☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\*Certified copies not received: \_\_\_\_\_

- ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

## Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited, PTO-892
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413
- ☒ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

--- SEE OFFICE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES ---

Art Unit: 2821

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Specification***

1. The specification, drawings, and claims have been checked to the extent necessary to determine the presence of all possible errors; however, applicant's cooperation is requested in correcting any other errors of which applicant may become aware in the specification, drawings, and claims.

2. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:

- the status of application number 08/600,400 should be disclosed, i.e., abandoned.
- page 1, line 8, "Disclosure Document No. 387572" is unclear as to what kind of document applicant refers to.

Appropriate correction is required.

### ***Claim Objections***

3. Claim 4 is objected to because of the following informalities: "one or at least one element" should properly be ---at least one element", since "at least one element" already includes "one" element.

Appropriate correction is required.

Art Unit: 2821

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Blocher et al. in view of the publication CO-NETIC & NETIC Magnetic Shielding Alloys.

Blocher et al. essentially discloses the claimed invention including a rectangular ballast case 10 made of an aluminum inherently for electromagnetic shielding; electrical and electronic circuitry, hardware attaching the electrical and electronic circuitry 26 to the ballast case; and external connecting wiring inherently in the ballast (figures 1-4; columns 1,4). Blocher et al. does not specify the shielding material as soft ferromagnetic alloy in the form of metal foil. However selection such particular material would have been considered well within the level of ordinary skill in the art as evidence in the publication CO-NETIC & NETIC Magnetic Shielding Alloys. Accordingly, an obvious modification would have provided the Blocher et al reference with these well known material in the art. Thus, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the

Art Unit: 2821

art at the time of applicant's claimed invention was made to have provided the Blocher et al. reference with the soft ferromagnetic material as it would have provided the lamp ballast with means for electromagnetic shielding since ferromagnetic material possesses high magnetic permeability characteristics as was well known in the art. The type of ballast, e.g., coil or electronic, would have been considered obvious as it would have provided the lamp with means for powering the lamp. The range of affecting electromagnetic frequency, e.g., 60 Hz to 100 kHz would have been considered obvious since a high frequency range would have reduced the lamp power consumption. Utilizing the shielding as metal foil and attached with adhesive to the ballast case would have been well within the level of ordinary skill in the art as it would have reduced electromagnetic energy from leaking to the environment.

### ***Conclusion***

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

The reference by McGraw-Hill Inc., "Magnetic Material" is cited as showing some properties of soft magnetic materials.


Art Unit: 2821

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to David Vu whose telephone number is (703) 305-6077.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0956.

D.V.

June 25, 1999

---

David H. Vu  
Examiner